



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(217)

CRM-M-16864-2025

Date of Decision: 24.9.2025

Deepak Parshad

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Subhash Chand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 of BNSS, has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 524 dated 14.9.2024 under Sections 376(2)(n) and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Saran, District Faridabad.
2. Short reply by way of affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mujesar, Faridabad, has been filed by the State in the Registry.
3. Prosecution story, in brief, is that the prosecutrix resided with her grandmother (maternal). On 16.08.2023, she started doing a job in a private company where she met the present petitioner, who used to work in the same company. They became friends. In the month of April, 2023 she had gone to her village in Punhana, and returned after five days. Deepak offered help to seek her a job. In that regard only, she was called by him on 23.04.2024, at Airforce turn from where, he took her to his house and administered some spurious substance in her meal due to which she became unconscious, and he committed rape against her by taking undue advantage of her condition. He thereafter extended threats that in case she disclosed



anything to anybody, she shall be done to death and her obscene photographs and video which he had prepared, shall be made viral on social media. She got petrified. On 20.06.2024, Deepak called her at ADB OYO Hotel, near Bata Turn, where again he indulged in sexual intercourse with her, against her wishes and without her consent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case by the prosecutrix. In fact, the petitioner and the prosecutrix were having a love affair. It is submitted there are no ingredients of committing rape with the prosecutrix are made out in the case, since their relationship was consensual. He further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 14.9.2024, and there is no other case registered against him.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence. Learned State counsel while referring to the FSL/DNA report dated 28.5.2025 annexed as Annexure R-1 with the reply, submits that as per the said report, DNA profile of the baby matches with the DNA profiles of the petitioner and the prosecutrix. Learned State counsel while referring to the report of DITAC, Gurugram, which has been annexed as Annexure R-2 with the reply, submits that upon analyzing the data recovered the mobile phone of the petitioner, which was extracted in a Pen-drive, it was found that the said data carries objectionable videos and photographs of the complainant. Therefore, it is submitted that in view of the serious allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

6. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.



7. *Prima facie*, serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner that on the pretext of securing an employment for the complainant, he committed rape upon her, clicked her objectionable photographs and made videos. Furthermore, allegations of committing rape upon the victim-complainant by threatening to release the said videos have also been made. As per Annexure R-2, which is the report received from DITAC, Gurugram, the data extracted from the mobile phone of the petitioner, contains the objectionable videos and photographs of the complainant. Further, the FSL/DNA report (Annexure R-1) also *prima facie* opines that the present petitioner and prosecutrix are the biological parents of the baby.

8. Therefore, keeping in view the above, and given the gravity of allegations levelled, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

10. However, keeping in view the fact, that the petitioner has been in custody for the last 01 year and 10 days, the learned trial Court is encouraged to conclude the trial expeditiously.

11. Needless to say that nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case, and the trial Court would proceed independent of the observations made herein, which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

September 24, 2025
Gurpreet Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No